arXiv:1401.6396v2 [math.OC] 9 Jul 2014

SYMBOLIC MODELS FOR NETWORKED CONTROL SYSTEMS

MAJID ZAMANI[1], MANUEL MAZO JR[2], AND ALESSANDRO ABATE[3]

Abstract. The last decade has witnessed significant attention on networked control systems (NCS) due to their high architecture flexibility and low installation and maintenance costs. In a NCS, communication between sensors, controllers, and actuators is supported by a shared communication channel that is subject to variable communication delays, quantization errors, packet losses, limited bandwidth, and other practical non-idealities leading to numerous technical challenges. Although stability properties of NCS have been investigated extensively in the past few years, there exist no remarkable results for NCS dealing with more complex and general objectives, such as verification or (controller) synthesis for logical specifications. This work investigates those complex objectives by constructively deriving symbolic models of NCS, while encompassing the mentioned network non-idealities: the obtained abstracted models can be employed to synthesize hybrid controllers enforcing rich logical specifications over NCS. Examples of such specifications include properties expressed as formulae in linear temporal logic (LTL) or as automata on infinite strings, as evidenced in a final example.

1. Introduction and Motivation

Over the last few years, the analysis and synthesis of networked control systems (NCS) has received significant attention, since NCS offer many advantages over traditional control systems, such as increasing architecture flexibility and reduced installation and maintenance costs. However, the numerous non-idealities of the network introduce new challenges for the analysis of the behavior of the plant (such as its stability) in a NCS and for the related synthesis of control schemes. One can categorize the various non-idealities of the network as follows: (i) quantization errors; (ii) packet dropouts; (iii) time-varying sampling/transmission intervals; (iv) time-varying communication delays; and (v) communication constraints (scheduling protocols). One can readily verify that the limited bandwidth of the network does not require a separate classification and can be incorporated in categories (i) and (iv).

Recently, there have been many studies focused mostly on the stability properties of NCS: in [6] (iii)-(v) are simultaneously considered; in [10] (i), (ii), and (iv) are taken into account; [1] studies (ii) and (v); [4] focuses on (ii) and (iii); in [9, 23] (ii)-(iv) are considered; and finally in [18] (i), (iii), and (v) are taken into account. Despite all the progress on stability analysis of NCS, as reported in [6, 10, 1, 4, 9, 23, 18] there are no notable results in the literature dealing with more complex objectives, such as verification or (controller) synthesis for richer, logical specifications. Examples of those specifications include linear temporal logic (LTL) formulae or automata over infinite strings [5], which cannot be easily investigated with existing approaches for NCS.

A promising direction to study these complex properties is the use of *symbolic models* [22]. Symbolic models are abstract descriptions of the original dynamical systems, where each abstract state (or symbol) corresponds to an aggregate of states in the concrete model. When a finite symbolic model is obtained and is formally put in relationship with the original system, one can leverage algorithmic machinery for controller synthesis of symbolic systems [16] to automatically synthesize hybrid controllers for the original, concrete model [22]. To the best of our knowledge, the only results available in the literature on the construction of symbolic models for NCS are the ones in [8, 7]: this work considers the network non-idealities (i), (ii), and (iv) simultaneously. However, the results in [8, 7] exhibit several possible shortcomings: they are limited to grid-based symbolic models, which practically are likely to severely suffer from the curse of dimensionality; they only consider static (i.e. memoryless) symbolic controllers whereas general temporal logic specifications often require dynamic (i.e. with memory) symbolic controllers [5]; specifications expressed exclusively in terms of some types of

nondeterministic automata can be addressed; the possibility of out-of-order packet arrivals is not considered; they only consider non-probabilistic plants; and, furthermore, the given specification needs an additional reformulation in an extended state-space, in order to apply standard algorithms for verification and synthesis to the obtained symbolic model.

In this paper, we provide a general construction of symbolic models for NCS, which can directly employ available symbolic models obtained exclusively for the plant. As such, one can directly use existing results to obtain symbolic models for the plant, such as the grid-based approaches in [13, 27], the recent results in [28] that do not require state-space discretization but only input set discretization, or the formula-guided (non-grid-based) approaches in [24]: from those plant symbolic models, one can then construct the symbolic models for the overall NCS. As a consequence, as long as there exists some type of symbolic abstraction of the plant, one can always use the results provided in this article to construct symbolic models for the overall, complex NCS. Hence, the proposed techniques in this paper can be used for stochastic plants as well, in view of the recent results providing symbolic models for such systems [28, 25, 26]. In this work, we explicitly consider the network non-idealities (i), (ii), and (iv) acting on the NCS simultaneously. We further explicitly consider possible out-of-order packet arrivals and message rejections, i.e. the effect of older data being neglected because more recent data is available. Let us remark that this work is not limited to problems where the controller is static: as a result we enable the study of larger classes of logical specifications such as those expressed as general LTL formulae or as automata on infinite strings, without requiring any specific reformulation.

Besides these extensions, the fundamental distinguishing feature of our work with respect to the recent contributions in [8, 7] is the nature of the triggering mechanism for message transmission: [8, 7] consider a sort of event-triggered mechanism, in which new sensor measurements are transmitted only once the actuator is updated with the control input computed using the last transmitted measurement. This, in turn, while preventing measurements from arriving out of order, restricts the applicability to systems in which sensors and actuators are co-located. In our approach, on the other hand, the sensors and controllers send new measurements/control updates in a periodic fashion. This forces dealing explicitly with out-of-order messages, but in exchange it removes any restriction on the location of sensors, controllers, or actuators.

2. Notation and basic concepts

2.1. **Notation.** The identity map on a set A is denoted by 1_A. The symbols $\mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{N}_0$, $\mathbb{Z}$, $\mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{R}^+$, and $\mathbb{R}_0^+$ denote the set of natural, nonnegative integer, integer, real, positive, and nonnegative real numbers, respectively. Given a set A, define $A^{n+1} = A \times A^n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Given a vector $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, we denote by x_i the i-th element of x, and by $\|x\|$ the infinity norm of x, namely, $\|x\| = \max\{|x_1|, |x_2|, ..., |x_n|\}$, where $|x_i|$ denotes the absolute value of x_i. Given an interval $[a, b] \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ with $a \leq b$, we denote by $[a; b]$ the set $[a, b] \cap \mathbb{N}$. We denote by $[\mathbb{R}^n]_\eta = \{a \in \mathbb{R}^n \mid a_i = k_i\eta,\ k_i \in \mathbb{Z},\ i = 1, \ldots, n\}$.

Given a measurable function $f : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$, the (essential) supremum of f is denoted by $\|f\|_\infty$; we recall that $\|f\|_\infty := (\text{ess})\sup\{\|f(t)\|, t \geq 0\}$. A continuous function $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$, is said to belong to class $\mathcal{K}$ if it is strictly increasing and $\gamma(0) = 0$; γ is said to belong to class $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ if $\gamma \in \mathcal{K}$ and $\gamma(r) \to \infty$ as $r \to \infty$. A continuous function $\beta : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ is said to belong to class $\mathcal{KL}$ if, for each fixed s, the map $\beta(r, s)$ belongs to class $\mathcal{K}$ with respect to r and, for each fixed nonzero r, the map $\beta(r, s)$ is decreasing with respect to s and $\beta(r, s) \to 0$ as $s \to \infty$. We identify a relation $R \subseteq A \times B$ with the map $R : A \to 2^B$ defined by $b \in R(a)$ iff $(a, b) \in R$. Given a relation $R \subseteq A \times B$, R^{-1} denotes the inverse relation defined by $R^{-1} = \{(b, a) \in B \times A : (a, b) \in R\}$. When R is an equivalence relation[1] on a set A, we denote by $[a]$ the equivalence class of $a \in A$, by A/R the set of all equivalence classes, and by $\pi_R : A \to A/R$ the natural projection map taking a point $a \in A$ to its equivalence class $\pi(a) = [a] \in A/R$.

2.2. **Control systems.** The class of control systems that we consider in this paper is formalized in the following definition.

[1]An equivalence relation $R \subseteq X \times X$ is a binary relation on a set X if it is reflexive, symmetric, and transitive.

Definition 2.1. *A control system is a tuple* $\Sigma = (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathsf{U}, \mathcal{U}, f)$*, where:*

- $\mathbb{R}^n$ *is the state space;*
- $\mathsf{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ *is the compact input set;*
- $\mathcal{U}$ *is a subset of the set of all measurable functions of time from intervals of the form* $]a, b[\subseteq \mathbb{R}$ *to* U *with* $a < 0$ *and* $b > 0$*;*
- $f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathsf{U} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ *is a continuous map satisfying the following Lipschitz assumption: for every compact set* $Q \subset \mathbb{R}^n$*, there exists a constant* $Z \in \mathbb{R}^+$ *such that* $\|f(x,u) - f(y,u)\| \leq Z\|x - y\|$ *for all* $x, y \in Q$ *and all* $u \in \mathsf{U}$*.*

A curve $\xi :]a, b[\to \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be a *trajectory* of Σ if there exists $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying:

$$\dot{\xi}(t) = f\left(\xi(t), \upsilon(t)\right),$$

for almost all $t \in]a, b[$. Although we have defined trajectories over open domains, we shall refer to trajectories $\xi : [0, t] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ defined on closed domains $[0, t]$, $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$, with the understanding of the existence of a trajectory $\xi' :]a, b[\to \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\xi = \xi'|_{[0,t]}$ with $a < 0$ and $b > t$. We also write $\xi_{x\upsilon}(t)$ to denote the point reached at time t under the input υ from the initial condition $x = \xi_{x\upsilon}(0)$; the point $\xi_{x\upsilon}(t)$ is uniquely determined, since the assumptions on f ensure existence and uniqueness of trajectories [21].

A control system Σ is said to be forward complete if every trajectory is defined on an interval of the form $]a, \infty[$. Sufficient and necessary conditions for a control system to be forward complete can be found in [3].

2.3. **Notions of stability and of completeness.** Some of the existing results, briefly recalled in this paper, require certain stability properties (or lack thereof) on Σ. First, we recall a stability property, introduced in [2], as defined next.

Definition 2.2. *A control system* Σ *is incrementally input-to-state stable (*δ*-ISS) if it is forward complete and there exist a* $\mathcal{KL}$ *function* β *and a* $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ *function* γ *such that for any* $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$*, any* $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$*, and any* $\upsilon, \upsilon' \in \mathcal{U}$*, the following condition is satisfied:*

$$\|\xi_{x\upsilon}(t) - \xi_{x'\upsilon'}(t)\| \leq \beta\left(\left\|x - x'\right\|, t\right) + \gamma\left(\|\upsilon - \upsilon'\|_\infty\right). \tag{2.1}$$

Next we recall a completeness property, introduced in [27], which can be satisfied by larger classes of (even unstable) control systems.

Definition 2.3. *A control system* Σ *is incrementally forward complete (*δ*-FC) if it is forward complete and there exist continuous functions* $\beta : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ *and* $\gamma : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$ *such that for each fixed* s*, the functions* $\beta(r, s)$ *and* $\gamma(r, s)$ *belong to class* $\mathcal{K}_\infty$ *with respect to* r*, and for any* $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$*, any* $x, x' \in \mathbb{R}^n$*, and any* $\upsilon, \upsilon' \in \mathcal{U}$*, the following condition is satisfied:*

$$\|\xi_{x\upsilon}(t) - \xi_{x'\upsilon'}(t)\| \leq \beta\left(\left\|x - x'\right\|, t\right) + \gamma\left(\|\upsilon - \upsilon'\|_\infty, t\right). \tag{2.2}$$

We refer the interested readers to the results in [2] (resp. [27]) providing a characterization (resp. description) of δ-ISS (resp. δ-FC) in terms of the existence of so-called *incremental Lyapunov functions*.

3. Systems & Approximate Equivalence Notions

We now recall the notion of *system*, as introduced in [22], that we later use to describe NCS as well as their symbolic abstractions.

Definition 3.1. *A system* S *is a tuple* $S = (X, X_0, U, \longrightarrow, Y, H)$ *consisting of: a (possibly infinite) set of states* X*; a (possibly infinite) set of initial states* $X_0 \subseteq X$*; a (possibly infinite) set of inputs* U*; a transition relation* $\longrightarrow \subseteq X \times U \times X$*; a set of outputs* Y*; and an output map* $H : X \to Y$*.*

A transition $(x, u, x') \in \longrightarrow$ is also denoted by $x \xrightarrow{u} x'$. If $x \xrightarrow{u} x'$, state x' is called a u-successor of state x. We denote by $\mathbf{Post}_u(x)$ the set of all u-successors of a state x and by $U(x)$ the set of inputs $u \in U$ for which $\mathbf{Post}_u(x)$ is nonempty.

System S is said to be:

- *metric*, if the output set Y is equipped with a metric $\mathbf{d} : Y \times Y \to \mathbb{R}_0^+$;
- *finite* (or *symbolic*), if X and U are finite sets;
- *countable*, if X and U are countable sets;
- *deterministic*, if for any state $x \in X$ and any input $u \in U$, $|\mathbf{Post}_u(x)| \leq 1$;
- *nondeterministic*, if there exist a state $x \in X$ and an input $u \in U$ such that $|\mathbf{Post}_u(x)| > 1$;

Given a system $S = (X, X_0, U, \longrightarrow, Y, H)$, we denote by $|S|$ the size of S, defined as $|S| := |\longrightarrow|$, which is equal to the total number of transitions in S. Note that it is more reasonable to consider $|\longrightarrow|$ as the size of S rather than $|X|$, as in practice it is the transitions of S that are required to be stored rather than just the states of S.

We recall the notions of (alternating) approximate (bi)simulation relation, introduced in [12, 20], which are useful to relate properties of NCS to those of their symbolic models. First we recall the notions of approximate (bi)simulation relation, introduced in [12].

Definition 3.2. *Let $S_a = (X_a, X_{a0}, U_a, \xrightarrow[a]{}, Y_a, H_a)$ and $S_b = (X_b, X_{b0}, U_b, \xrightarrow[b]{}, Y_b, H_b)$ be metric systems with the same output sets $Y_a = Y_b$ and metric $\mathbf{d}$. For $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, a relation $R \subseteq X_a \times X_b$ is said to be an ε-approximate simulation relation from S_a to S_b if the following three conditions are satisfied:*

(i) *for every $x_{a0} \in X_{a0}$, there exists $x_{b0} \in X_{b0}$ with $(x_{a0}, x_{b0}) \in R$;*
(ii) *for every $(x_a, x_b) \in R$, we have $\mathbf{d}(H_a(x_a), H_b(x_b)) \leq \varepsilon$;*
(iii) *for every $(x_a, x_b) \in R$, the existence of $x_a \xrightarrow[a]{u_a} x'_a$ in S_a implies the existence of $x_b \xrightarrow[b]{u_b} x'_b$ in S_b satisfying $(x'_a, x'_b) \in R$.*

A relation $R \subseteq X_a \times X_b$ is said to be an ε-approximate bisimulation relation between S_a and S_b if R is an ε-approximate simulation relation from S_a to S_b and R^{-1} is an ε-approximate simulation relation from S_b to S_a.
System S_a is ε-approximately simulated by S_b, or S_b ε-approximately simulates S_a, denoted by $S_a \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_b$, if there exists an ε-approximate simulation relation from S_a to S_b. System S_a is ε-approximatly bisimilar to S_b, denoted by $S_a \cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_b$, if there exists an ε-approximate bisimulation relation between S_a and S_b.

As explained in [20], for nondeterministic systems we need to consider relationships that explicitly capture the adversarial nature of nondeterminism. Furthermore, these types of relations become crucial to enable the refinement of symbolic controllers [22].

Definition 3.3. *Let $S_a = (X_a, X_{a0}, U_a, \xrightarrow[a]{}, Y_a, H_a)$ and $S_b = (X_b, X_{b0}, U_b, \xrightarrow[b]{}, Y_b, H_b)$ be metric systems with the same output sets $Y_a = Y_b$ and metric $\mathbf{d}$. For $\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$, a relation $R \subseteq X_a \times X_b$ is said to be an alternating ε-approximate simulation relation from S_a to S_b if conditions (i) and (ii) in Definition 3.2, as well as the following condition, are satisfied:*

(iii) *for every $(x_a, x_b) \in R$ and for every $u_a \in U_a(x_a)$ there exists some $u_b \in U_b(x_b)$ such that for every $x'_b \in \boldsymbol{Post}_{u_b}(x_b)$ there exists $x'_a \in \boldsymbol{Post}_{u_a}(x_a)$ satisfying $(x'_a, x'_b) \in R$.*

A relation $R \subseteq X_a \times X_b$ is said to be an alternating ε-approximate bisimulation relation between S_a and S_b if R is an alternating ε-approximate simulation relation from S_a to S_b and R^{-1} is an alternating ε-approximate simulation relation from S_b to S_a.
System S_a is alternatingly ε-approximately simulated by S_b, or S_b alternatingly ε-approximately simulates S_a, denoted by $S_a \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_b$, if there exists an alternating ε-approximate simulation relation from S_a to S_b. System



FIGURE 1. Schematics of a networked control system $\widetilde{\Sigma}$.

S_a is alternatingly ε-approximately bisimilar to S_b, denoted by $S_a \cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_b$, if there exists an alternating ε-approximate bisimulation relation between S_a and S_b.

It can be readily seen that the notions of approximate (bi)simulation relation and of alternating approximate (bi)simulation relation coincide when the systems involved are deterministic, as in Definition 3.1.

Let us define a metric system $S_\tau(\Sigma) := (X_\tau, X_{\tau 0}, U_\tau, \xrightarrow[\tau]{}, Y_\tau, H_\tau)$, capturing all the information contained in the control system Σ, assumed to be forward complete, at the sampling times:

- $X_\tau = \mathbb{R}^n$;
- $X_{\tau 0} = \mathbb{R}^n$;
- $U_\tau = \mathcal{U}$;
- $x_\tau \xrightarrow[\tau]{\upsilon_\tau} x'_\tau$ if there exists a trajectory $\xi_{x_\tau \upsilon_\tau} : [0, \tau] \to \mathbb{R}^n$ of Σ satisfying $\xi_{x_\tau \upsilon_\tau}(\tau) = x'_\tau$;
- $Y_\tau = \mathbb{R}^n / Q$ for some given equivalence relation $Q \subseteq X_\tau \times X_\tau$;
- $H_\tau = \pi_Q$.

Notice that the set of states and inputs of $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ are uncountable and that $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ is a deterministic system in the sense of Definition 3.1 since (cf. Subsection 2.2) the trajectory of Σ is uniquely determined. We also assume that the output set Y_τ is equipped with a metric $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau} : Y_\tau \times Y_\tau \to \mathbb{R}^+_0$.

We refer the interested readers to [13, 27] proposing results on the existence of symbolic abstractions $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) := (X_{\mathsf{q}}, X_{\mathsf{q}0}, U_{\mathsf{q}}, \xrightarrow[\mathsf{q}]{}, Y_{\mathsf{q}}, H_{\mathsf{q}})$ for $S_\tau(\Sigma)$. In particular, the results in [13] and [27] provide symbolic abstractions $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ for δ-ISS and δ-FC control systems Σ, respectively, such that $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) \cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_\tau(\Sigma)$ (equivalently $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) \cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_\tau(\Sigma)$)[2] and $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_\tau(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$, respectively. The proposed results in [13, 27] assume that Q is the identity relation in the definition of $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ implying that $Y_\tau = \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\pi_Q = 1_{\mathbb{R}^n}$, $\mathcal{U}$ is the set of piecewise constant curves of duration τ (cf. equation (4.3)), and the metric $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}$ is the natural infinity norm metric.

Remark 3.4. *Consider the metric system $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ admitting an abstraction $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$. Since the plant Σ is forward complete, one can readily verify that given any state $x_\tau \in X_\tau$ there always exists a υ_τ-successor of x_τ for any $\upsilon_\tau \in U_\tau$. Hence, $U_\tau(x_\tau) = U_\tau$ for any $x_\tau \in X_\tau$. Therefore, without loss of generality, one can also assume that $U_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{\mathsf{q}}) = U_{\mathsf{q}}$ for any $x_{\mathsf{q}} \in X_{\mathsf{q}}$.*

4. Models of Networked Control Systems

Consider a NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ as depicted schematically in Figure 1 similar to the ones in [9, Figure 1] and [23, Figure 1]. The NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ includes a plant Σ, a time-driven sampler, and an event-driven zero-order-hold (ZOH), all of which

[2]Let us recall that the notions of alternating approximate (bi)simulation and of approximate (bi)simulation relation coincide when the systems involved are deterministic as per Definition 3.1.



FIGURE 2. Time-delays in the controller-to-actuator branch of the network with $\Delta^{\rm ca}_k \in \{\tau, 2\tau, 3\tau\}$.

are described in more detail afterwards. The NCS consists of a forward complete plant $\Sigma = (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathsf{U}, \mathcal{U}, f)$, which is connected to a symbolic controller, explained in more detail in the next subsection, over a communication network that induces delays ($\Delta^{\rm sc}$ and $\Delta^{\rm ca}$). The state measurements of the plant are sampled by a time-driven sampler at times $s_k := k\tau$, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and we denote $x_k := \xi(s_k)$. The discrete-time control values computed by the symbolic controller at times s_k are denoted by u_k. Time-varying network-induced delays, i.e. the sensor-to-controller delay ($\Delta^{\rm sc}_k$) and the controller-to-actuator delay ($\Delta^{\rm ca}_k$), are included in the model. Moreover, packet dropouts in both channels of the network can be incorporated in the delays $\Delta^{\rm sc}_k$ and $\Delta^{\rm ca}_k$ (enlarging them) as long as the maximum number of subsequent dropouts over the network is bounded [14]. Finally, the varying computation time, needed to evaluate the symbolic controller, is incorporated into $\Delta^{\rm ca}_k$. We assume that the time-varying delays are bounded and are integer multiples of the sampling time τ, i.e. $\Delta^{\rm sc}_k := N^{\rm sc}_k \tau$, where $N^{\rm sc}_k \in [N^{\rm sc}_{\min}; N^{\rm sc}_{\max}]$, and $\Delta^{\rm ca}_k := N^{\rm ca}_k \tau$, where $N^{\rm ca}_k \in [N^{\rm ca}_{\min}; N^{\rm ca}_{\max}]$, for some $N^{\rm sc}_{\min}, N^{\rm sc}_{\max}, N^{\rm ca}_{\min}, N^{\rm ca}_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Under these assumptions, there is no difference in assuming that both the controller and the actuator act in an event-driven fashion (i.e. they respond instantaneously to newly arrived data) or time-driven fashion (i.e. they respond to newly arrived data at the sampling instants s_k). Furthermore, we model the occurrence of message rejection, i.e. the effect of older data being neglected because more recent data is available before the older data arrival, as done in [9, 23]. The zero-order-hold (ZOH) function (see Figure 1) is placed before the plant Σ to transform the discrete-time control inputs u_k, $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, to a continuous-time control input $\upsilon(t) = u_{k^*(t)}$, where $k^*(t) := \max\{k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \mid s_k + \Delta^{\rm ca}_k \leq t\}$. As argued in [9, 23], in the sampling interval $[s_k, s_{k+1}[$, $\upsilon(t)$ can be explicitly described by

$$\upsilon(t) = u_{k+j_*-N^{\rm ca}_{\max}}, \text{ for } t \in [s_k, s_{k+1}[\,, \tag{4.1}$$

where $j_* \in [0; N^{\rm ca}_{\max} - N^{\rm ca}_{\min}]$ is defined as:

$$j_* = \widehat{f}\left(\widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\min}}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\max}}\right), \tag{4.2}$$

where $\widehat{N}_k$, for $k \in [N^{\rm ca}_{\min}; N^{\rm ca}_{\max}]$, is the delay suffered by the control packet sent k samples ago, namely $\widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\max}-i} = N^{\rm ca}_{k-N^{\rm ca}_{\max}+i}$ for any $i \in [0; N^{\rm ca}_{\max} - N^{\rm ca}_{\min}]$ and

$$\widehat{f}\left(\widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\min}}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\max}}\right) = \max\left\{\arg\min_j \widehat{g}\left(j, \widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\min}}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\max}}\right)\right\},$$

where

$$\widehat{g}\Big(j, \widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\min}}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\max}}\Big) = \min\Big\{\max\left\{0, \widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\max}-j} + j - N^{\rm ca}_{\max}\right\}, \max\left\{0, \widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\max}-1-j} + j - N^{\rm ca}_{\max} + 1\right\},$$
$$\ldots, \max\left\{0, \widehat{N}_{N^{\rm ca}_{\min}} - N^{\rm ca}_{\min}\right\}, 1\Big\},$$

with $j \in [0; N^{\rm ca}_{\max} - N^{\rm ca}_{\min}]$. Note that the expression for the continuous-time control input in (4.1) and (4.2) takes into account the possible out-of-order packet arrivals and message rejection. For example, in Figure 4, the time-delays in the controller-to-actuator branch of the network are allowed to take values in $\{\tau, 2\tau, 3\tau\}$, resulting in a message rejection at time s_{k+2}. We refer the interested readers to references [9, 23] for more details on the proposed choices for j_* (4.2), $\widehat{f}$, and $\widehat{g}$.

4.1. **Symbolic controller architecture.** A symbolic controller is a finite system that take the observed states $x_k \in \mathbb{R}^n$ as inputs and produces as outputs the actions $u_k \in \mathsf{U}$ that need to be fed into the system Σ in order to satisfy some complex logical specifications. We refer the interested readers to [22] to consult the formal definition of symbolic controllers. Although for some LTL specifications such as safety or reachability it may be sufficient to consider only static controllers (i.e. without memory) [11], we do not limit our work by this assumption. The approach in what follows is indeed applicable to general LTL specifications, which require dynamic controllers (i.e. the controller has a memory) [5]. Due to the presence of a ZOH, from now on we assume that the set $\mathcal{U}$ contains only curves that are constant over intervals of length $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and take values in U, i.e.:

$$\mathcal{U} = \left\{\upsilon : \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathsf{U} | \upsilon(t) = \upsilon((s-1)\tau), t \in [(s-1)\tau, s\tau[, s \in \mathbb{N}\right\}. \tag{4.3}$$

Correspondingly, one should update U_τ to $\mathcal{U}$ (4.3) in the definition of $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ (cf. Section 3).

Similar to what was assumed in the connection between controller and plant, we also consider the possible occurrence of message rejection for the measurement data sent from the sensor to the symbolic controller. The symbolic controller uses $\widehat{x}_k$ as an input at the sampling times $s_k := k\tau$, where

$$\widehat{x}_k = x_{k+\ell_*-N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \tag{4.4}$$

where $\ell_* \in [0; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max} - N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}]$ is defined as:

$$\ell_* = \widehat{f}\left(\widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}}, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}\right), \tag{4.5}$$

where $\widetilde{N}_k$, for $k \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, is the delay suffered by the measurement packet sent k samples ago, namely $\widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-i} = N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{k-N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}+i}$ for any $i \in [0; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max} - N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}]$, and $\widehat{f}$ is the function appearing in (4.2). Note that the expression for the input of the controller in (4.4) and (4.5) takes into account the possible out-of-order packet arrivals and message rejection. Again, we refer the interested readers to references [9, 23] for more details on the proposed choice for ℓ_* (4.5).

4.2. **Description of NCS as metric systems.** Given $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ and the NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$, now consider the metric system $S(\widetilde{\Sigma}) := (X, X_0, U, \longrightarrow, Y, H)$, capturing all the information contained in the NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$, where:

- $X = \{X_\tau \cup q\}^{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}} \times U_\tau^{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}} \times [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]^{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}} \times [N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]^{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}$, where q is a dummy symbol;
- $X_0 = \left\{\left(x_0, q, \ldots, q, \upsilon_0, \ldots, \upsilon_0, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, \ldots, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}, \ldots, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}\right) \mid x_0 \in X_{\tau 0}, \upsilon_0 \in U_\tau\right\}$;
- $U = U_\tau$;
- $\left(x_1, \ldots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_1, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right) \xrightarrow{\upsilon} \left(x', x_1, \ldots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1}, \upsilon, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1}, \widetilde{N}, \widetilde{N}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1}, \widehat{N}, \widehat{N}_1, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1}\right)$ for all $\widetilde{N} \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$ and all $\widehat{N} \in [N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$ if there exists transition $x_1 \xrightarrow[\tau]{\upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-j_*}} x'$ in $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ where $j_* = \widehat{f}\left(\widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right)$, defined in (4.2);
- $Y = Y_\tau \times Y_\tau$;
- $H\left(x_1, \ldots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_1, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right) = \left(H_\tau(x_1), H_\tau\left(x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-\ell_*}\right)\right)$ where $\ell_* = \widehat{f}\left(\widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}}, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}\right)$, defined in (4.5). With a slight abuse of notation, we assume that $H_\tau(q) := q$.

Note that the choice of the set of state X in $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ allows us to keep track of an adequate number of measurements and control packets and the corresponding delays suffered by them, which is sufficient and necessary in order to consider out-of-order packet arrivals and message rejections. The transition relation of $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is capturing in a nondeterministic fashion all the possible successors of a given state of $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ based on all the possible ordering of measurements arriving to the controller and of inputs arriving to the ZOH.

Let us remark that the set of states and inputs of $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ are uncountable and that $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is a nondeterministic system in the sense of Definition 3.1, since depending on the values of $\widetilde{N}$ and $\widehat{N}$, more than one υ-successor of any state of $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ may exist.

Remark 4.1. *Note that the output value of any state of $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is a pair: the first entry is the output of the plant available at the sensors at times $s_k := k\tau$, and the second one is the output of the plant available at the controller at the same times s_k taking into consideration the occurrence of message rejection (cf. see Figure 1 for the pair of outputs). Note that, with the output map defined as we suggest, the synthesis of controllers should be performed using the first entries of the output pairs to define the satisfaction of properties. This is so because usually specifications are expressed in terms of the outputs exhibited by the plant, i.e. what is available at the sensors before the network. However, the controller refinement (and any interconnection analysis) should make use of the second entry of the output pairs as those are the outputs received by the controllers. In the present paper we do not dive further into these issues, which are left as object of future research.*

We assume that the output set Y is equipped with the metric $\mathbf{d}_Y$ that is induced by the metric $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}$, as the following: given any $\mathsf{x} := \left(x_1, \ldots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_1, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right)$ and $\mathsf{x}' := \left(x'_1, \ldots, x'_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon'_1, \ldots, \upsilon'_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}'_1, \ldots, \widetilde{N}'_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}'_1, \ldots, \widehat{N}'_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right)$ in X, we set

$$\mathbf{d}_Y\left(H\left(\mathsf{x}_\tau\right), H\left(\mathsf{x}'_\tau\right)\right) = \mathbf{d}_Y\left((x_1, x_k), (x'_1, x'_k)\right) := \max\left\{\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}\left(H_\tau\left(x_1\right), H_\tau\left(x'_1\right)\right), \mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}\left(H_\tau\left(x_k\right), H_\tau\left(x'_k\right)\right)\right\}, \tag{4.6}$$

for some given $k \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, where we extend the metric $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}$ such that $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}\left(H_\tau(x), H_\tau(q)\right) = +\infty$ for any $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}\left(H_\tau(q), H_\tau(q)\right) = 0$. Hence, two states of $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ are ε-close if not only the first entries of their outputs are ε-close but also if the second entries are too.

5. Symbolic Models for NCS

This section contains the main contributions of the paper. We show the existence and construction of symbolic models for NCS by using an existing symbolic model for the plant Σ, namely a model $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) := (X_{\mathsf{q}}, X_{\mathsf{q}0}, U_{\mathsf{q}}, \xrightarrow[\mathsf{q}]{}, Y_{\mathsf{q}}, H_{\mathsf{q}})$.

Define the metric system $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma}) := \left(X_*, X_{*0}, U_*, \xrightarrow[*]{}, Y_*, H_*\right)$, where

- $X_* = \{X_{\mathsf{q}} \cup q\}^{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}} \times U_{\mathsf{q}}^{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}} \times [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]^{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}} \times [N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]^{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}$;
- $X_{*0} = \{(x_{*0}, q, \ldots, q, u_{*0}, \ldots, u_{*0}, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, \ldots, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}, \ldots, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}) \mid x_{*0} \in X_{\mathsf{q}0}, u_{*0} \in U_{\mathsf{q}}\}$;
- $U_* = U_{\mathsf{q}}$;
- $\left(x_{*1}, \ldots, x_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, u_{*1}, \ldots, u_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right) \xrightarrow[*]{u_*} \left(x'_*, x_{*1}, \ldots, x_{*(N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1)}, u_*, u_{*1}, \ldots, u_{*(N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1)}, \widetilde{N}_*, \widetilde{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{*(N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1)}, \widehat{N}_*, \widehat{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{*(N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1)}\right)$ for all $\widetilde{N}_* \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$ and all $\widehat{N}_* \in [N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$ if there exists transition $x_{*1} \xrightarrow[\mathsf{q}]{u_{*(N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-j_*)}} x'_*$ in $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ where $j_* = \widehat{f}\left(\widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right)$, defined in (4.2);
- $Y_* = Y_{\mathsf{q}} \times Y_{\mathsf{q}}$;
- $H_*\left(x_{*1}, \ldots, x_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, u_{*1}, \ldots, u_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right) = \left(H_{\mathsf{q}}\left(x_{*1}\right), H_{\mathsf{q}}\left(x_{*(N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-\ell_*)}\right)\right)$ where $\ell_* = \widehat{f}\left(\widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}}, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}\right)$, defined in (4.5). With a slight abuse of notation, we set $H_{\mathsf{q}}(q) := q$.

It can be readily seen that the system $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is countable or symbolic if the system $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ is countable or symbolic, respectively. Although $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ may be a deterministic system, $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is always a nondeterministic system, since depending on the possible delays in both channels of the network (i.e. the values of $\widetilde{N}_*$ and $\widehat{N}_*$), more than one u_*-successor of any state of $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ may exist. The system $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is constructed in the same way as $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ but replacing continuous states, inputs, and transition relation of $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ with the corresponding ones in $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$.



FIGURE 3. The symbol $\sim$ represents any of the following relations: $\overset{\varepsilon}{\mathcal{S}}\succeq$, $\preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}}$, and $\cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}}$.



FIGURE 4. Shifting functions φ and ψ for the symbolic controller to the other side of the communication network.

We can now state the first pair of main technical results of this work, schematically represented in Figure 3.

Theorem 5.1. *Consider a NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ and suppose that there exists an abstraction $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ such that $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_\tau(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$. Then we have $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$.*

The proof of Theorem 5.1 is provided in the Appendix.

Corollary 5.2. *Consider a NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ and suppose that there exists an abstraction $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ such that $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) \cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_\tau(\Sigma)$. Then we have $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$.*

Proof. Using Theorem 5.1 one gets that $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_\tau(\Sigma)$ implies $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ equipped with the alternating ε-approximate simulation relation $\widetilde{R}$ as defined in the proof of Theorem 5.1. In a similar way, one can show that $S_\tau(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ implies $S(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ equipped with the alternating ε-approximate simulation relation $\widetilde{R}^{-1}$ which completes the proof. □

Remark 5.3. *By consulting the formal definition of symbolic controllers in* [22]*, one can readily verify the existence of two static functions $\varphi : X_\tau \to X_{\mathsf{q}}$ and $\psi : U_{\mathsf{q}} \to \mathsf{U}$, inside the symbolic controllers, associating to any $x_\tau \in X_\tau$ one symbol $x_{\mathsf{q}} \in X_{\mathsf{q}}$ and to any symbol $u_{\mathsf{q}} \in U_{\mathsf{q}}$ one control value $u_\tau \in \mathsf{U}$, respectively, as shown in Figure 4. Since the functions φ and ψ are static, without violating the main results one can shift those functions toward sensor and actuator in the NCS as shown in Figure 4. If $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ is symbolic, then U_{q} and X_{q} are finite sets. Hence, one can automatically take care of limited bandwidth constraints without introducing additional quantization errors. As also noted in* [8, 7]*, for the grid-based symbolic abstractions $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ proposed in* [13, 27]*, one has: $\psi = 1_{U_{\mathsf{q}}}$ and $\varphi : x \to [x]_\eta$, where $[x]_\eta \in [\mathbb{R}^n]_\eta$ such that $\|x - [x]_\eta\| \leq \eta/2$ for a given state space quantization parameter $\eta \in \mathbb{R}^+$.*

The next subsection provides similar results as the ones in Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.2 when the symbolic controller is static.

5.1. **Specialized results for static symbolic controllers.** There are specifications, such as safety and reachability [11], that can be enforced by static controllers. Assuming that the symbolic controller is static, both delays $\Delta_k^{\rm sc}$ and $\Delta_k^{\rm ca}$ can be captured by a single delay $\Delta_k := \Delta_k^{\rm sc} + \Delta_k^{\rm ca}$ [9, 23] and shifted to the controller-to-actuator branch of the network: that is, denoting by $\widetilde{\Delta}_k^{\rm sc/ca}$ the delays in the new model, we have $\widetilde{\Delta}_k^{\rm sc} = 0$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}_k^{\rm ca} = \Delta_k$. Therefore, one can also only consider the occurrence of message rejection in the control data.

Given $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ and the NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$, now consider the metric system $\overline{S}(\widetilde{\Sigma}) := (X, X_0, U, \longrightarrow, Y, H)$, capturing all the information contained in the NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$, where:

- $X = X_\tau \times U_\tau^{N_{\max}} \times [N_{\min}; N_{\max}]^{N_{\max}}$;
- $X_0 = \{(x_0, \upsilon_0, \ldots, \upsilon_0, N_{\max}, \ldots, N_{\max}) \mid x_0 \in X_{\tau 0}, \upsilon_0 \in U_\tau\}$;
- $U = U_\tau$;
- $(x_1, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N_{\max}}, N_1, \ldots, N_{N_{\max}}) \xrightarrow{\upsilon} (x', \upsilon, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N_{\max}-1}, N, N_1, \ldots, N_{N_{\max}-1})$ for all $N \in [N_{\min}; N_{\max}]$ if there exists transition $x_1 \xrightarrow[\tau]{\upsilon_{N_{\max}-j_*}} x'$ in $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ where $j_* = \widehat{f}\,(N_{N_{\min}}, \ldots, N_{\max})$, defined in (4.2);
- $Y = Y_\tau$;
- $H\,(x_1, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N_{\max}}, N_1, \ldots, N_{N_{\max}}) = H_\tau(x_1)$,

where $N_{\min} = N_{\min}^{\rm sc} + N_{\min}^{\rm ca}$ and $N_{\max} = N_{\max}^{\rm sc} + N_{\max}^{\rm ca}$. Note that the set of states and inputs of $\overline{S}(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ are uncountable and that $\overline{S}(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is a nondeterministic system, since depending on the values of N, more than one υ-successor of any state of $\overline{S}(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ may exist.

We now propose a symbolic model for the NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ using an existing symbolic model for Σ, namely, $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) := (X_{\mathsf{q}}, X_{\mathsf{q}0}, U_{\mathsf{q}}, \underset{\mathsf{q}}{\longrightarrow}, Y_{\mathsf{q}}, H_{\mathsf{q}})$.

Define the metric system $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma}) := \Big(X_*, X_{*0}, U_*, \underset{*}{\longrightarrow}, Y_*, H_*\Big)$, where

- $X_* = X_{\mathsf{q}} \times U_{\mathsf{q}}^{N_{\max}} \times [N_{\min}; N_{\max}]^{N_{\max}}$;
- $X_{*0} = \{(x_{*0}, u_{*0}, \ldots, u_{*0}, N_{\max}, \ldots, N_{\max}) \mid x_{*0} \in X_{\mathsf{q}0}, u_{*0} \in U_{\mathsf{q}}\}$;
- $U_* = U_{\mathsf{q}}$;
- $(x_{*1}, u_{*1}, \ldots, u_{*N_{\max}}, N_{*1}, \ldots, N_{*N_{\max}}) \xrightarrow[*]{u_*} \big(x'_*, u_*, u_{*1}, \ldots, u_{*(N_{\max}-1)}, N_*, N_{*1}, \ldots, N_{*(N_{\max}-1)}\big)$ for all $N_* \in [N_{\min}; N_{\max}]$ if there exists transition $x_{*1} \xrightarrow[\mathsf{q}]{u_{*(N_{\max}-j_*)}} x'_*$ in $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ where $j_* = \widehat{f}\,(N_{*N_{\min}}, \ldots, N_{*N_{\max}})$, defined in (4.2);
- $Y_* = Y_{\mathsf{q}}$;
- $H_*\big(x_{*1}, u_{*1}, \ldots, u_{*N_{\max}}, N_{*1}, \ldots, N_{*N_{\max}}\big) = H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*1})$.

It can be readily seen that the system $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is countable or symbolic if the system $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ is countable or symbolic, respectively. Although $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ may be a deterministic system, $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is always a nondeterministic one, since depending on the possible delays in both channels of the network (i.e. the values of N_*), more than one u_*-successor of any state of $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ may exist.

Note that Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.2 are still valid for systems $\overline{S}(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ and $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$, schematically depicted in Figure 3, as the following:

Corollary 5.4. *Consider a NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ and suppose that the symbolic controller is static and there exists an abstraction $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ such that $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_\tau(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$. Then we have $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} \overline{S}(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} \overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the one of Theorem 5.1. □

Corollary 5.5. *Consider a NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ and suppose that the symbolic controller is static and there exists an abstraction $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ such that $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) \cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_\tau(\Sigma)$. Then we have $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \cong^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} \overline{S}(\widetilde{\Sigma})$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to the one of Corollary 5.2. □

Remark 5.6. *One of the distinguishing contributions of our work with respect to* [8, 7] *is that our results do not hinge on any assumption on the controller. Hence, the provided abstractions here are amenable to any available synthesis techniques and tools, e.g.* PESSOA [17] *and* SPIN [15]*, (whether resulting in static or dynamic controllers). Contrary, the authors in* [8, 7] *were forced to provide specific constructions for both the controller synthesis and the specification reformulation due to the employed assumptions and the convolved output values of the proposed abstractions.*

5.2. **Extensions to stochastic plants.** As pointed out in the introduction, one of the main advantages of the proposed results here in comparison with the existing ones in [8, 7] is that one can construct symbolic models for NCS using symbolic models obtained exclusively for the plant. Therefore, one can readily extend the previous proposed results here to other classes of control systems, e.g. stochastic control systems, as long as there exist techniques to construct their symbolic models. Let $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space endowed with a filtration $\mathbb{F} = (\mathcal{F}_t)_{t\geq 0}$ satisfying the usual conditions of completeness and right continuity [19]. Let $(W_t)_{t\geq 0}$ be a p-dimensional $\mathbb{F}$-adapted Brownian motion.

Definition 5.7. *A* stochastic control system *is a tuple $\Sigma = (\mathbb{R}^n, \mathsf{U}, \mathcal{U}, f, \sigma)$, where*

- *$\mathbb{R}^n$ is the state space;*
- *$\mathsf{U} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ is the compact input set;*
- *$\mathcal{U}$ is defined in* (4.3)*;*
- *$f : \mathbb{R}^n \times \mathsf{U} \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is globally Lipschitz continuous jointly in both arguments;*
- *$\sigma : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^{n\times p}$ is globally Lipschitz continuous.*

A continuous-time stochastic process $\xi : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$ is said to be a *solution process* of Σ if there exists $\upsilon \in \mathcal{U}$ satisfying:

$$\mathrm{d}\,\xi(t) = f(\xi(t), \upsilon(t))\,\mathrm{d}\,t + \sigma(\xi(t))\,\mathrm{d}\,W_t,$$

$\mathbb{P}$-almost surely ($\mathbb{P}$-a.s.). Using the same notation as in Subsection 2.2, we write $\xi_{a\upsilon}(t)$ to denote the value of the solution process at time $t \in \mathbb{R}_0^+$ under the input signal υ from initial condition $\xi_{a\upsilon}(0) = a$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s., in which a is a random variable that is measurable in $\mathcal{F}_0$. Note that the solution process is uniquely determined, since the assumptions on f and σ ensure its existence and uniqueness [19, Theorem 5.2.1, p. 68]. Similar to the non-probabilistic case, one can represent a stochastic control system Σ with a metric system $S_\tau(\Sigma) := (X_\tau, X_{\tau 0}, U_\tau, \underset{\tau}{\longrightarrow}, Y_\tau, H_\tau)$, capturing all the information contained in the plant Σ at the sampling times:

- X_τ is the set of all $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued random variables defined on the probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{F}, \mathbb{P})$;
- $X_{\tau 0}$ is the set of all $\mathbb{R}^n$-valued random variables that are measurable over the trivial sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}_0$;

- $U_\tau = \mathcal{U}$;
- $x_\tau \xrightarrow[\tau]{\upsilon_\tau} x'_\tau$ if x_τ and x'_τ are measurable, respectively, in $\mathcal{F}_{k\tau}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{(k+1)\tau}$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$, and there exists a solution process $\xi : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}_0^+ \to \mathbb{R}^n$ of Σ satisfying $\xi(k\tau) = x_\tau$ and $\xi_{x_\tau \upsilon_\tau}(\tau) = x'_\tau$ $\mathbb{P}$-a.s.;
- $Y_\tau = X_\tau$;
- $H_\tau = 1_{X_\tau}$.

We assume that the output set Y_τ is equipped with the metric $\mathbf{d}(y, y') = \left(\mathbb{E}\left[\|y - y'\|^q\right]\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$, for any $y, y' \in Y_\tau$ and some $q \geq 1$.

Now one can leverage the recently developed results in [26], [28] (not requiring state-space gridding) and [25] to construct symbolic models $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) := (X_{\mathsf{q}}, X_{\mathsf{q}0}, U_{\mathsf{q}}, \xrightarrow[\mathsf{q}]{}, Y_{\mathsf{q}}, H_{\mathsf{q}})$ for $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ when the stochastic control system Σ satisfies the stochastic versions of δ-ISS (cf. Definition 3.1 in [26, 28]) and δ-FC (cf. Definition 2.2 in [25]), respectively. Hence, one can use all the previous established techniques in this paper for a NCS with a stochastic plant.

6. Space Complexity Analysis

We compare the results provided here with the ones provided in [8, 7] in terms of the size of the proposed symbolic models. For the sake of a fair comparison, assume that we use also a grid-based symbolic abstraction for the plant Σ using the same sampling time and quantization parameters as the ones in [8, 7]. By assuming that we are only interested in the dynamics of Σ on a compact set $\mathsf{D} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, the size of the set of states of the symbolic models, provided in [8, 7], is:

$$|X_\star| = \sum_{i \in \{\{1\} \cup [N_{\min}; N_{\max}]\}} \left|[\mathsf{D}]_\eta\right|^i.$$

Meanwhile, the size of the set of states for the abstractions provided by Theorem 5.1 and Corollary 5.2, is at most:

$$|X_*| = \left(\left|[\mathsf{D}]_\eta\right| + 1\right)^{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}} \cdot \left|[\mathsf{U}]_\mu\right|^{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}} \cdot (N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max} - N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min} + 1)^{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}} \cdot (N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max} - N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min} + 1)^{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}},$$

and for the ones provided by Corollaries 5.4 and 5.5, is at most:

$$|X_*| = \left|[\mathsf{D}]_\eta\right| \cdot \left|[\mathsf{U}]_\mu\right|^{N_{\max}} \cdot (N_{\max} - N_{\min} + 1)^{N_{\max}}, \tag{6.1}$$

where $[\mathsf{D}]_\eta = \mathsf{D} \cap [\mathbb{R}^n]_\eta$, $[\mathsf{U}]_\mu = \mathsf{U} \cap [\mathbb{R}^m]_\mu$ for some quantization parameters $\eta, \mu \in \mathbb{R}^+$, $N_{\min} = N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min} + N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}$ and $N_{\max} = N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max} + N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}$. Note that there may exist some states of X_* that are not reachable from any of the initial states $x_{*0} \in X_{*0}$ due to the combination of the delays in both channels of the network and, hence, one can exclude them from the set of states X_* without loss of generality. Therefore, the actual size of the state set X_* may be less than the aforementioned computed ones such as the one in the example section.

One can easily verify that the size of the symbolic models proposed in [8, 7] is at most:

$$\left|S_\star(\widetilde{\Sigma})\right| = |X_\star| \cdot |[\mathsf{U}]_\mu| \cdot (N_{\max} - N_{\min} + 1) \cdot K = \left(\sum_{i \in \{\{1\} \cup [N_{\min}; N_{\max}]\}} \left|[\mathsf{D}]_\eta\right|^i\right) \cdot |[\mathsf{U}]_\mu| \cdot (N_{\max} - N_{\min} + 1) \cdot K, \tag{6.2}$$

where K is the maximum number of u-successors of any state of the symbolic model $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ for $u \in [\mathsf{U}]_\mu$. Note that with the results proposed in [13] one has $K = 1$ because $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ is a deterministic system, while with the ones proposed in [27] one has $K \geq 1$ because $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ is a nondeterministic system and the value of K depends on the functions β and γ in (2.2), see [27] for more details. The sizes of the symbolic models provided in this

paper are at most:

$$\left|S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})\right| = |X_*| \cdot |[\mathsf{U}]_\mu| \cdot (N^{\rm sc}_{\max} - N^{\rm sc}_{\min} + 1) \cdot (N^{\rm ca}_{\max} - N^{\rm ca}_{\min} + 1)\,.K \tag{6.3}$$
$$= \left(\left|[\mathsf{D}]_\eta\right| + 1\right)^{N^{\rm sc}_{\max}} \cdot \left|[\mathsf{U}]_\mu\right|^{N^{\rm ca}_{\max}+1} \cdot (N^{\rm sc}_{\max} - N^{\rm sc}_{\min} + 1)^{N^{\rm sc}_{\max}+1} \cdot (N^{\rm ca}_{\max} - N^{\rm ca}_{\min} + 1)^{N^{\rm ca}_{\max}+1} \cdot K,$$

$$\left|\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})\right| = |X_*| \cdot |[\mathsf{U}]_\mu| \cdot (N_{\max} - N_{\min} + 1)\,.K = \left|[\mathsf{D}]_\eta\right| \cdot \left|[\mathsf{U}]_\mu\right|^{N_{\max}+1} \cdot (N_{\max} - N_{\min} + 1)^{N_{\max}+1} \cdot K, \tag{6.4}$$

with the same K as in (6.2). For the sake of a fair comparison, one should compare the sizes in (6.2) and (6.4) because in both symbolic models $S_\star(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ and $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ it is assumed that the symbolic controllers are static. It can be readily verified that if $\left|[\mathsf{D}]_\eta\right|$ is much bigger than $\left|[\mathsf{U}]_\mu\right|$ $\left(\left|[\mathsf{D}]_\eta\right| >> \left|[\mathsf{U}]_\mu\right|\right)$ which is often the case, $\left|\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})\right|$ can be much smaller than $\left|S_\star(\widetilde{\Sigma})\right|$ specially for large values of $N_{\max}$. The symbolic model $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ can also have a smaller size for large values of $N_{\max}$ and for $\left|[\mathsf{D}]_\eta\right| >> \left|[\mathsf{U}]_\mu\right|$, as shown in the following numerical example.

Example 6.1. *Consider a plant Σ such that $\mathsf{D} = [-1,1] \times [-1,1]$, $\mathsf{U} = [0,1]$, $\eta = 0.1$, and $\mu = 1$. Assume that the delays in different parts of the network are as the following: $N^{sc}_{\min} = 1$, $N^{sc}_{\max} = 2$, $N^{ca}_{\min} = 2$, and $N^{ca}_{\max} = 3$. Using equations (6.2), (6.3), and (6.4), one obtains:*

$$\left|S_\star(\widetilde{\Sigma})\right| = 6.1594 \times 10^{13} K,\ \left|S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})\right| = 3.2932 \times 10^8 K,$$
$$\left|\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})\right| = 1.8662 \times 10^7 K.$$

It can be readily verified that the sizes of our proposed abstractions $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ and $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ are roughly 2×10^5 and 3×10^6 times smaller than the one of $S_\star(\widetilde{\Sigma})$, proposed in [8, 7]*, respectively.*

Remark 6.2. *Note that in Remark 5.2 in* [8]*, the authors suggest a more concise representation for their proposed finite abstractions of NCS in order to reduce the space complexity. However, this representation is only applicable if the plant Σ is δ-ISS. Hence, for general classes of plants Σ in the NCS, our proposed approach is potentially more appropriate in terms of the size of the abstractions specially for large values of $N_{\max}$.*

7. Example

Here we elucidate the results of the paper on a simple example by constructing the symbolic model of a NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$. Assume that the plant Σ of a NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$ admits a simple ε-approximate bisimilar symbolic model $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ with only two states as depicted in Figure 5 where the initial states are showed as targets of sourceless arrows. One can readily verify that $X_{\mathsf{q}} = X_{\mathsf{q}0} = \{x, y\}$, $U_{\mathsf{q}} = \{a, b\}$, $\xrightarrow[\mathsf{q}]{} = \{(x,a,x), (x,b,y), (y,a,x), (y,b,y)\}$, $Y_{\mathsf{q}} = \{Z, W\}$, $H_{\mathsf{q}}(x) = Z$, and $H_{\mathsf{q}}(y) = W$. Here we assume that the symbolic controller is static, $N_{\min} = N^{\rm sc}_{\min} + N^{\rm ca}_{\min} = 1$, and $N_{\max} = N^{\rm sc}_{\max} + N^{\rm ca}_{\max} = 2$. The resulted ε-approximate bisimilar symbolic model $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ of $\overline{S}(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ is depicted in Figure 6. The initial states of $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ are also showed as targets of sourceless and thicker arrows in Figure 6. The output values of the states of $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ are Z or W if the first elements of the states are x or y, respectively, which are not shown in Figure 6 for the sake of simplicity. One can readily see that the number of states of X_* is 24 which is less than the computed one in (6.1) which is 32 because states $(x,a,b,1,1)$, $(y,a,a,1,1)$, $(x,b,b,2,1)$, $(y,b,a,2,1)$, $(y,a,a,2,1)$, $(y,b,a,1,1)$, $(x,b,b,1,1)$, and $(x,a,b,2,1)$ are not reachable from the initial states.

8. Discussion and Conclusions

In this paper we have provided a construction of symbolic models for NCS, subject to the following non-idealities: variable communication delays, quantization errors, packet losses, and limited bandwidth. This novel approach is practically relevant since it can leverage any existing symbolic model for the plant, and in particular is not limited to grid-based ones and extendible to work over stochastic plants – both features



FIGURE 5. Finite system describing $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$. The lower part of the states are labeled with the outputs (Z and W).



FIGURE 6. The resulted bisimilar symbolic model $\overline{S}_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ of the NCS $\widetilde{\Sigma}$.

are current focus of active investigation elsewhere. Furthermore, this approach can be applied to treat any specification expressed as a formula in LTL or as an automaton on infinite strings without requiring additional formulations. Finally, we have shown that the proposed methodology results, in general, in smaller abstractions than alternative and related approaches in the literature [8, 7].

Future work will concentrate on the following goals: 1) providing efficient implementations of the symbolic models, the existence of which has been shown in this work; 2) the construction of symbolic models for NCS by considering explicit probabilistic structure over the transmission intervals, communication delays, and packet dropouts; 3) the construction of symbolic models for still more general NCS, by considering additional network non-idealities, in particular time-varying sampling and transmission intervals.

References

[1] R. Alur, A. D'Innocenzo, K. H. Johansson, G. J. Pappas, and G. Weiss. Compositional modeling and analysis of multi-hop control networks. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 56(10):2345–2357, 2011.

[2] D. Angeli. A Lyapunov approach to incremental stability properties. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 47(3):410–421, 2002.

[3] D. Angeli and E. D. Sontag. Forward completeness, unboundedness observability, and their Lyapunov characterizations. *Systems and Control Letters*, 38:209–217, 1999.

[4] D. Antunes, J. P. Hespanha, and C. Silvestre. Volterra integral approach to impulsive renewal systems: Application to networked control. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(3):607–619, March 2012.

[5] C. Baier and J. P. Katoen. *Principles of model checking*. The MIT Press, April 2008.

[6] N. W. Bauer, P. J. H. Maas, and W. P. M. H. Heemels. Stability analysis of networked control systems: a sum of squares approach. *Automatica*, 48(8):1514–1524, 2012.

[7] A. Borri, G. Pola, and M.D. Di Benedetto. Integrated symbolic design of unstable nonlinear networked control systems. *in Proceedings of 51th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, December 2012.

[8] A. Borri, G. Pola, and M.D. Di Benedetto. A symbolic approach to the design of nonlinear networked control systems. *in Proceedings of 15th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, pages 255–264, April 2012.

[9] M. B. G. Cloosterman, N. van de Wouw, W. P. M. H. Heemels, and H. Nijmeijer. Stability of networked control systems with uncertain time-varying delays. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(7):1575–1580, July 2009.

[10] H. Gao, T. Chen, and J. Lam. A new delay system approach to network-based control. *Automatica*, 44(1):39–52, 2008.

[11] A. Girard. Synthesis using approximately bisimilar abstractions: state-feedback controllers for safety specifications. *in Proceedings of 13th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, pages 111–120, April 2010.

[12] A. Girard and G. J. Pappas. Approximation metrics for discrete and continuous systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 25(5):782–798, 2007.

[13] A. Girard, G. Pola, and P. Tabuada. Approximately bisimilar symbolic models for incrementally stable switched systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 55(1):116–126, 2009.

[14] W. P. M. H. Heemels and N. van de Wouw. Stability and stabilization of networked control systems. In A. Bemporad, W. P. M. H. Heemels, and M. Johansson, editors, *Networked Control Systems*, volume 406 of *Lecture Notes in Control and Information Sciences*, pages 203–253. Springer London, 2010.

[15] G. Holzmann. *The SPIN model checker: Primer and reference manual*. Addison-Wesley Professional, 1 edition edition, 2003.

[16] O. Maler, A. Pnueli, and J. Sifakis. On the synthesis of discrete controllers for timed systems. *in Proceedings of 12th Annual Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science*, 900:229–242, 1995.

[17] M. Mazo Jr., A. Davitian, and P. Tabuada. PESSOA: A tool for embedded control software synthesis. In T. Touili, B. Cook, and P. Jackson, editors, *Computer Aided Verification (CAV)*, volume 6174 of *LNCS*, pages 566–569. Springer-Verlag, July 2010.

[18] D. Nesic and D. Liberzon. A unified framework for design and analysis of networked and quantized control systems. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 54(4):732–747, 2009.

[19] B. K. Oksendal. *Stochastic differential equations: An introduction with applications*. Springer, 5th edition, November 2002.

[20] G. Pola and P. Tabuada. Symbolic models for nonlinear control systems: alternating approximate bisimulations. *SIAM Journal on Control and Optimization*, 48(2):719–733, 2009.

[21] E. D. Sontag. *Mathematical control theory: Deterministic finite dimensional systems*, volume 6. Springer-Verlag, New York, 2nd edition, 1998.

[22] P. Tabuada. *Verification and Control of Hybrid Systems, A symbolic approach*. Springer US, 2009.

[23] N. van de Wouw, D. Nesic, and W. P. M. H. Heemels. A discrete-time framework for stability analysis of nonlinear networked control systems. *Automatica*, 48(6):1144–1153, June 2012.

[24] B. Yordanov, J. Tumova, I. Cerna, J. Barnat, and C. Belta. Formal analysis of piecewise affine systems through fomula-guided refinement. *Automatica*, 49(1):261–266, January 2013.

[25] M. Zamani, P. Mohajerin Esfahani, A. Abate, and J. Lygeros. Symbolic models for stochastic control systems without stability assumptions. In *Proceedings of European Control Conference*, pages 4257–4262, July 2013.

[26] M. Zamani, P. Mohajerin Esfahani, R. Majumdar, A. Abate, and J. Lygeros. Symbolic control of stochastic systems via approximately bisimilar finite abstractions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control, forthcoming, arXiv: 1302.3868*, 2014.

[27] M. Zamani, G. Pola, M. Mazo Jr., and P. Tabuada. Symbolic models for nonlinear control systems without stability assumptions. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 57(7):1804–1809, July 2012.

[28] M. Zamani, I. Tkachev, and A. Abate. Bisimilar symbolic models for stochastic control systems without state-space discretization. In *Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Hybrid Systems: Computation and Control*, pages 41–50. ACM New York, NY, USA, April 2014.

9. Appendix

Proof of Theorem 5.1. We start by proving $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$. Since $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{AS}} S_\tau(\Sigma)$, there exists an alternating ε-approximate simulation relation R from $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ to $S_\tau(\Sigma)$. Consider the relation $\widetilde{R} \subseteq X_* \times X$ defined by $(\mathsf{x}_*, \mathsf{x}) \in \widetilde{R}$, where $\mathsf{x}_* = \Big(x_{*1}, \dots, x_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, u_{*1}, \dots, u_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_{*1}, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_{*1}, \dots, \widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\Big)$ and $\mathsf{x} = \big(x_1, \dots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon_1, \dots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_1, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_1, \dots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\big)$, if and only if $\widetilde{N}_{*i} = \widetilde{N}_i$, $\forall i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, $\widehat{N}_{*j} = \widehat{N}_j$, $\forall j \in [1; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$, $(x_{*k}, x_k) \in R$, $\forall k \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, and for each u_{*i} and the corresponding υ_i there exists $x'_* \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_{*i}}(x_*)$ such that $(x'_*, \xi_{x\upsilon_i}(\tau)) \in R$ for any $i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$ and any $(x_*, x) \in R$. Note that if $U_\tau = U_{\mathsf{q}}$ and they are finite then the last condition of the relation $\widetilde{R}$ is nothing more than requiring $u_{*i} = \upsilon_i$ for any $i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$.

Consider $\mathsf{x}_{*0} := (x_{*0}, q, \dots, q, u_{*0}, \dots, u_{*0}, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, \dots, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}, \dots, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}) \in X_{*0}$. Due to the relation R, there exist $x_0 \in X_{\tau 0}$ such that $(x_{*0}, x_0) \in R$ and $\upsilon_0 \in U_\tau$ such that there exists $x'_* \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_{*0}}(x_*)$ satisfying $(x'_*, \xi_{x\upsilon_0}(\tau)) \in R$ for any $(x_*, x) \in R$. Hence, by choosing $\mathsf{x}_0 := (x_0, q, \dots, q, \upsilon_0, \dots, \upsilon_0, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, \dots, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}, \dots, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}) \in X_0$, one gets $(\mathsf{x}_{*0}, \mathsf{x}_0) \in \widetilde{R}$ and condition (i) in Definition 3.3 is satisfied.

Now consider any $(\mathsf{x}_*, \mathsf{x}) \in \widetilde{R}$, where $\mathsf{x}_* = \Big(x_{*1}, \dots, x_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, u_{*1}, \dots, u_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_{*1}, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_{*1}, \dots, \widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\Big)$ and $\mathsf{x} = \Big(x_1, \dots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon_1, \dots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_1, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_1, \dots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\Big)$. Since $\widetilde{N}_{*i} = \widetilde{N}_i$, $\forall i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, and $\widehat{N}_{*j} = \widehat{N}_j$, $\forall j \in [1; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$, and using definitions of $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ and $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$, one obtains $H_*(\mathsf{x}_*) = (x_{*1}, x_{*k})$ and $H(\mathsf{x}) = (x_1, x_k)$, for some $k \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$ (cf. Definitions $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ and $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$). Since $(x_{*i}, x_i) \in R$, $\forall i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, one gets $\mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*i}), H_\tau(x_i)) \leq \varepsilon$, $\forall i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$. Therefore, $\mathbf{d}_Y(H_*(\mathsf{x}_*), H(\mathsf{x})) = \max\{\mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*1}), H_\tau(x_1)), \mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*k}), H_\tau(x_k))\} \leq \varepsilon$ and condition (ii) in Definition 3.3 is satisfied.

Let us now show that condition (iii) in Definition 3.3 holds. Consider any $(\mathsf{x}_*, \mathsf{x}) \in \widetilde{R}$, where $\mathsf{x}_* = \Big(x_{*1}, \dots, x_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, u_{*1}, \dots, u_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_{*1}, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_{*1}, \dots, \widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\Big)$, $\mathsf{x} = \Big(x_1, \dots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon_1, \dots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_1, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_1, \dots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\Big)$. Consider any $u_* \in U_*(\mathsf{x}_*) = U_{\mathsf{q}}$. Using the relation R, there exist $\upsilon \in U(\mathsf{x}) = U_\tau$ and $\dot{x}_* \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_*}(x_*)$ such that $(\dot{x}_*, \xi_{x\upsilon}(\tau)) \in R$ for any $(x_*, x) \in R$. Now consider any $\mathsf{x}' = \Big(x', x_1, \dots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1}, \upsilon, \upsilon_1, \dots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1}, \widetilde{N}, \widetilde{N}_1, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1}, \widehat{N}, \widehat{N}_1, \dots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1}\Big) \in \mathbf{Post}_\upsilon(\mathsf{x}) \subseteq X$ for some $\widetilde{N} \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$ and $\widehat{N} \in [N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$ where $x' = \xi_{x_1\upsilon_k}(\tau)$ for some given $k \in [N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$ (cf. Definition $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$). Because of the relation R, there exists $x'_* \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_{*k}}(x_{*1})$ in $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ such that $(x'_*, x') \in R$. Hence, due to the definition $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$, one can choose $\mathsf{x}'_* = \Big(x'_*, x_{*1}, \dots, x_{*\left(N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1\right)}, u_*, u_{*1}, \dots, u_{*\left(N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1\right)}, \widetilde{N}, \widetilde{N}_1, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1}, \widehat{N}, \widehat{N}_1, \dots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1}\Big) \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_*}(\mathsf{x}_*) \subseteq X_*$. Due to the relation R, one can readily verify that $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_{\mathsf{q}}(x'_*), H_\tau(x')) \leq \varepsilon$. Since $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*j}), H_\tau(x_j)) \leq \varepsilon$, $\forall j \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max} - 1]$, one gets $\mathbf{d}_Y(H_*(\mathsf{x}'_*), H(\mathsf{x}')) = \max\big\{\mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_{\mathsf{q}}(x'_*), H_\tau(x')), \mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*k}), H_\tau(x_k))\big\} \leq \varepsilon$, for some given[3] $k \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min} - 1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max} - 1]$ (cf. Definitions $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ and $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$). Hence, $(\mathsf{x}'_*, \mathsf{x}') \in \widetilde{R}$ implying that condition (iii) in Definition 3.3 holds.

Now we prove $S(\widetilde{\Sigma}) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$. Since $S_\tau(\Sigma) \preceq^{\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{S}} S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$, there exists an ε-approximate simulation relation R from $S_\tau(\Sigma)$ to $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$. Consider the relation $\widetilde{R} \subseteq X \times X_*$ defined by $(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{x}_*) \in \widetilde{R}$, where $\mathsf{x} = \Big(x_1, \dots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon_1, \dots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_1, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_1, \dots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\Big)$ and $\mathsf{x}_* = \Big(x_{*1}, \dots, x_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, u_{*1}, \dots, u_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_{*1}, \dots, \widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_{*1}, \dots, \widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\Big)$, if and only if $\widetilde{N}_i = \widetilde{N}_{*i}$, $\forall i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, $\widehat{N}_j = \widehat{N}_{*j}$, $\forall j \in [1; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$, $(x_k, x_{*k}) \in R$, $\forall k \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, and for each υ_i and the corresponding u_{*i} there exists a $x'_* \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_{*i}}(x_*)$ such that $(\xi_{x\upsilon_i}(\tau), x'_*) \in R$ for any $i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$ and any $(x, x_*) \in R$. Note that if

[3]Note that if $N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min} = 0$, then $x_{*(-1)} = x'_*$ and $x_{-1} = x'$.

$U_\tau = U_{\mathsf{q}}$ and they are finite then the last condition of the relation $\widetilde{R}$ is nothing more than requiring $u_{*i} = \upsilon_i$ for any $i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$.

Consider $\mathsf{x}_0 := (x_0, q, \ldots, q, \upsilon_0, \ldots, \upsilon_0, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, \ldots, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}, \ldots, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}) \in X_0$. Due to the relation R, there exist $x_{*0} \in X_{*0}$ such that $(x_0, x_{*0}) \in R$ and $u_{*0} \in U_{\mathsf{q}}$ such that there exists $x'_* \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_{*0}}(x_*)$ satisfying $(\xi_{x\upsilon_0}(\tau), x'_*) \in R$ for any $(x, x_*) \in R$. Hence, by choosing $\mathsf{x}_{*0} := (x_{*0}, q, \ldots, q, u_{*0}, \ldots, u_{*0}, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, \ldots, N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}, \ldots, N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}) \in X_{*0}$, one gets $(\mathsf{x}_0, \mathsf{x}_{*0}) \in \widetilde{R}$ and condition (i) in Definition 3.2 is satisfied.

Now consider any $(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{x}_*) \in \widetilde{R}$, where $\mathsf{x} = \left(x_1, \ldots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_1, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right)$ and $\mathsf{x}_* = \left(x_{*1}, \ldots, x_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, u_{*1}, \ldots, u_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\right)$. Since $\widetilde{N}_i = \widetilde{N}_{*i}$, $\forall i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, and $\widehat{N}_j = \widehat{N}_{*j}$, $\forall j \in [1; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$, and using definitions of $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ and $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$, one obtains $H(\mathsf{x}) = (x_1, x_k)$ and $H_*(\mathsf{x}) = (x_{*1}, x_{*k})$, for some $k \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$ (cf. Definitions $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ and $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$). Since $(x_i, x_{*i}) \in R$, $\forall i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$, one gets $\mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_\tau(x_i), H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*i})) \leq \varepsilon$, $\forall i \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$. Therefore, $\mathbf{d}_Y(H(\mathsf{x}), H_*(\mathsf{x}_*)) = \max\{\mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_\tau(x_1), H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*1})), \mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_\tau(x_k), H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*k}))\} \leq \varepsilon$ and condition (ii) in Definition 3.2 is satisfied.

Let us now show that condition (iii) in Definition 3.2 holds. Consider any $(\mathsf{x}, \mathsf{x}_*) \in \widetilde{R}$, where $\mathsf{x} = \Big(x_1, \ldots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_1, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\Big)$, $\mathsf{x}_* = \Big(x_{*1}, \ldots, x_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, u_{*1}, \ldots, u_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}, \widetilde{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}}, \widehat{N}_{*1}, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{*N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}}\Big)$. Consider any $\upsilon \in U(\mathsf{x}) = U_\tau$. Using the relation R, there exist $u_* \in U_*(\mathsf{x}_*) = U_{\mathsf{q}}$ and $\dot{x}_* \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_*}(x_*)$ such that $(\xi_{x\upsilon}(\tau), \dot{x}_*) \in R$ for any $(x, x_*) \in R$. Now consider any $\mathsf{x}' = \big(x', x_1, \ldots, x_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1}, \upsilon, \upsilon_1, \ldots, \upsilon_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1}, \widetilde{N}, \widetilde{N}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1}, \widehat{N}, \widehat{N}_1 \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1}\big) \in \mathbf{Post}_\upsilon(\mathsf{x}) \subseteq X$ for some $\widetilde{N} \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}]$ and $\widehat{N} \in [N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$ where $x' = \xi_{x\upsilon_k}(\tau)$ for some given $k \in [N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\min}; N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}]$ (cf. Definition $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$). Because of the relation R, there exists $x'_* \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_{*k}}(x_{*1})$ in $S_{\mathsf{q}}(\Sigma)$ such that $(x', x'_*) \in R$. Hence, due to the definition $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$, one can choose $\mathsf{x}'_* = \Big(x'_*, x_{*1}, \ldots, x_{*\left(N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1\right)}, u_*, u_{*1}, \ldots, u_{*\left(N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1\right)}, \widetilde{N}, \widetilde{N}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{N}_{N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max}-1}, \widehat{N}, \widehat{N}_1, \ldots, \widehat{N}_{N^{\mathrm{ca}}_{\max}-1}\Big) \in \mathbf{Post}_{u_*}(\mathsf{x}_*) \subseteq X_*$. Due to the relation R, one can readily verify that $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_\tau(x'), H_{\mathsf{q}}(x'_*)) \leq \varepsilon$. Since $\mathbf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_\tau(x_j), H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*j})) \leq \varepsilon$, $\forall j \in [1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max} - 1]$, one gets $\mathbf{d}_Y(H(\mathsf{x}'), H_*(\mathsf{x}'_*)) = \max\left\{\mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_\tau(x'), H_{\mathsf{q}}(x'_*)), \mathsf{d}_{Y_\tau}(H_\tau(x_k), H_{\mathsf{q}}(x_{*k}))\right\} \leq \varepsilon$, for some given[3] $k \in [N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\min} - 1; N^{\mathrm{sc}}_{\max} - 1]$ (cf. Definitions $S_*(\widetilde{\Sigma})$ and $S(\widetilde{\Sigma})$). Hence, $(\mathsf{x}', \mathsf{x}'_*) \in \widetilde{R}$ implying that condition (iii) in Definition 3.2 holds, which completes the proof. □

[1]Department of Electrical Engineering and Information Technology, Technische Universität München, 80333, Munich, Germany.

E-mail address: zamani@tum.de

URL: http://www.hcs.ei.tum.de

[2]Delft Center for Systems and Control, Delft University of Technology, 2628 CD, Delft, The Netherlands.

E-mail address: m.mazo@tudelft.nl

URL: http://www.dcsc.tudelft.nl/∼mmazo

[3]Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, OX1 3QD, Oxford, United Kingdom.

E-mail address: alessandro.abate@cs.ox.ac.uk

URL: http://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/people/alessandro.abate